IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA ELKINS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff.

v.

CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 2:11-CR-30 (BAILEY)

WOODROW JEFFERSON DAVIS, III,

Defendant.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On this day, the above-styled matter came before the Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of United States Magistrate Judge John S. Kaull [Doc. 14], filed December 12, 2011. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommends that this Court deny the defendant's Motion to Suppress Evidence [Doc. 10], filed November 23, 2011.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Snyder v.*

1

Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91,

94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Kaull's R&R were due on

December 29, 2011, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). To date, no objections have been

filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the R&R for clear error.

Upon careful review, it is the opinion of this Court that the magistrate judge's Report

and Recommendation [Doc. 14] should be, and is, hereby ORDERED ADOPTED for the

reasons more fully stated therein. Accordingly, this Court hereby **DENIES** the defendant's

Motion to Suppress Evidence [Doc. 10].

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record.

DATED: December 30, 2011.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2